

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

No claims have been added, amended, withdrawn, or cancelled.

Claims 29-56 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 29-56 have been rejected.

SUMMARY OF THE REJECTIONS/OBJECTIONS

Claims 29, 30, 35, 43, 44 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Tada et al.* (Pat. No. 5,544,359).

Claims 31, 33, 36, 39, 40, 42, 45, 47, 50, 53, 54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tada et al.* (Pat. No. 5,544,359) as applied to Claims 29 and 43 above, and further in view of *Cohen et al.* (Pat. No. 5,903,898).

Claims 32, 37, 46, and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tada et al.* (pat. No. 5,544,359) and *Cohen et al.* (Pat No. 5,903,898) as applied to Claims 29 and 43 above, and further in view of *Dovich et al.* (Pat. No. 6,308,168).

Claims 34 and 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tada et al.* (pat. No. 5,544,359) and *Cohen et al.* (Pat No. 5,903,898) as applied to Claims 29 and 43 above, and further in view of *Miller, Jr. et al.* (Pat. No. 6,446,074).

Claims 38 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tada et al.* (pat. No. 5,544,359) as applied to Claims 29 and 43 above, and further in view of *Veldhuisen et al.* (Pat. No. 6,480,850).

Claims 41 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tada* et al. (pat. No. 5,544,359) as applied to Claims 29 and 43 above, and further in view of *Doherty* et al (Pat. No. 5,991,772) and *Cohen* et al. (Pat. No. 5,903,898).

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 29

Claim 29 features:

“A method for using a log associated with a first database to update a second database, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:
based on said log that is associated with said first database, identifying first data;
generating second data based on said first data; and
sending said second data to said second database.”

Claim 29 was rejected as being anticipated by *Tada*. However, nothing in *Tada* discloses or teaches the limitations of Claim 29.

Claim 29 features using a log for a first database to identify first data that is used to generate second data that is sent to a second database. The specification of the present application describes an embodiment that features these limitations. While Claim 29 does not and is not intended to include all of the details of the disclosed embodiment, a discussion of that embodiment may promote a better understanding of Claim 29, and how Claim 29 fundamentally differs from *Tada*. Specifically, in the embodiment illustrated in Figs. 1, 3, and 8 of the Application, the first database is operational data store (ODS) 11, the second database is enterprise data warehouse 16, and log monitor 26 performs the steps of identifying, generating, and sending. Log monitor 26 opens log file 54 in step 151 and then reads a log entry in step 152. If the log entry applies to a listed table in step 153, the log entry is evaluated by log monitor 26 against a rule set 55 in step 154. If the log entry satisfies the rule

set in step 155, log monitor 26 generates an updated record using metadata 56 in step 156.

Then log monitor 26 sends the updated record to data warehouse 16.

In contrast to Claim 29, *Tada* discloses an approach for logging data for use in recovery from crashes in a database (Col. 1, lines 9-10), not an approach for logging data from a first database for use in updating a second database. More specifically, *Tada* discloses a log data acquiring unit that acquires log data for each transaction. A classifying unit then classifies the log data for each transaction. Third, the classifying unit creates the historical log files for each database and the log data for each of the databases are transferred to their respective historical file buffers. (Col. 5, lines 47-58).

With respect to the first limitation of Claim 29, the Office Action equates the “log that is associated with said first database” of Claim 29 with the two historical log files of *Tada*, as illustrated by elements 318a and 318b of *Tada*’s figures 1 and 2. *Tada*’s log files 318a and 318b are associated, respectively, with a first database 319a and a second database 319b of *Tada*’s figures 1 and 2. The Office Action then equates “First Classification” of figures 1 and 2 of *Tada* with the “first data” of Claim 29. Even if it were true that the log of Claim 29 is equivalent to the historical log files of *Tada*, Claim 29 requires the step of identifying first data “based on said log.” However, the data referred to in the drawings as “First Classification” is *written to* a historical log file, and is *not identified based upon* the historical log file. More specifically, *Tada* teaches that “the log data stored in the HLF buffer (314a) [‘First Classification’] *is written in the historical log file* 318a for the database 1 by a log data writing unit 313. Likewise, the data stored in the second HLF buffer (314b) [‘Second Classification’] is written in the historical log file 318b for the database 2 by the log data writing unit 313” (Col. 5, lines 34-38) (emphasis added).

Thus, “First Classification” is not identified based upon the historical log file, but rather merely appears to temporarily store log data transferred to the classifying unit from a log data acquiring unit (Col. 5, lines 47-53). Thus, *Tada* fails to teach or disclose the first limitation of Claim 29, namely identifying first data “based on said log associated with said first database.”

The second limitation of Claim 29 is “generating second data based on said first data.” The Office Action asserts that the “first data” and “second data” of Claim 29 are equivalent to “First Classification” and “Second Classification,” respectively, of figures 1 and 2 in *Tada*. However, Claim 29 requires that the second data be generated “based on said first data.” “Second Classification” of figures 1 and 2 is not generated based on “First Classification,” but rather “Second Classification” is generated by the classifying unit, in response to the classifying unit classifying log data. Specifically, *Tada* teaches that “the log data are classified by a classifying unit (310) and transferred to a first HLF buffer (314a) [‘First Classification’] or a second HLF buffer (314b) [‘Second Classification’]” (Col. 5, lines 32-34). Therefore, *Tada* fails to teach and disclose the second limitation of Claim 29, namely the step of “generating second data based on said first data.”

With respect to the third limitation of Claim 29, the Office Action alleges that *Tada* teaches the step of “sending said second data to said second database,” as required by Claim 29, and that “second data” of Claim 29 is equivalent to “Second Classification” of *Tada*. However, “Second Classification” is not sent to the second database of *Tada*’s figures 1 and 2. Rather, the data referred to as “Second Classification” is sent to the second historical file via the second historical file buffer (figures 1 and 2 of *Tada*). *Tada* specifically states that “the data stored in the second HLF buffer (314b) [‘Second Classification’] is written in the

historical log file 318b” (Col. 5, lines 36-38). Therefore, *Tada* fails to teach “sending said second data to said second database,” as required by claim 29.

Because *Tada* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 29, the Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons stated above, Claim 29 is allowable over the art of record and is in condition for allowance.

CLAIM 43

Claim 43 includes limitations similar to Claim 29, except in the context of computer-readable media. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 43 is patentable over *Tada* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 29.

CLAIMS 30-42 AND 44-56

Claims 30-42 and 44-56 are dependent upon Claims 29 and 43 respectively, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding independent claims. The other cited references in the Office Action are not even alleged to teach the elements of independent Claim 29 that are missing from *Tada*. Thus, the other cited references in combination with *Tada* fail to disclose alone, or in combination, all the elements of the dependent claims. Each of Claims 30-42 and 44-56 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 29 and 43. In addition, each of Claims 30-42 and 44-56 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 30-42 and 44-56 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 29 and 43.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Brian D. Hickman
Reg. No. 35,894

Date: July 21, 2004

1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125
(408) 414-1080, ext. 201
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 7/21/2004 by Dawn Fukushima